

## ***SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS:***

By Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000)

1. Build on common ground established by a sense of place or community, mutual goals or fears, or a shared vision;
2. Create new opportunities for interaction among diverse groups;
3. Employ meaningful, effective, and enduring collaborative processes;
4. Focus on the problem in a new and different way by fostering a more open, flexible, holistic mind-set;
5. Foster a sense of responsibility, ownership, and commitment;
6. Recognize that partnerships are made up of people, not institutions;
7. Move forward through proactive and entrepreneurial behavior;
8. Mobilize support and resources from numerous sources.

"We are unabashedly optimistic about the potential for good to come from expanded collaborative efforts. Such relationships are not a panacea... but there really is no choice."

## ***PRIMER FOR AGENCIES***

**By Wondolleck & Yaffee (2000)**

1. Help your employees *imagine* the possibilities of collaboration in carrying out important work, building necessary relationships, and generating better decisions.
2. *Enable* your employees to develop and use collaborative arrangements by such means as enhancing employee capabilities and providing resources and flexibility to those who are already motivated to collaborate.
3. *Encourage* your employees to experiment with collaborative approaches to resource management by influencing the attitudes of staff and supervisors and providing incentives to employees and groups outside the agency to be involved in collaborative initiatives.
4. *Evaluate* the effectiveness of differing approaches to promoting and undertaking collaborative arrangements in the agency and how they might be modified.
5. *Be committed* to the process and follow through with your agencies' agreements and responsibilities.

## ***FOUR CORNERS WATERSHED INITIATIVE***

### **LESSONS LEARNED**

1. Critical to the watershed approach is the commitment of the state to execute programs at the watershed level and its willingness to:
  - a) resolve bureaucratic gridlock and “hardening of the categories” among the array of fragmented but interdependent programs, and
  - b) make available a rational and intelligible set of options for local partners.
2. Use the innumerable opportunities for agency staff to be creative, to maximize use of their discretionary authority and permissive program guidance, and to modify regulations, decisions, and other actions to the extent legally possible in support of watershed-based initiatives.
3. Develop the appropriate level of agency staff support for watershed efforts – not too heavy, not too light – and encourage the development and nurturing of personal relationships.
4. State agencies (and others) need to play key roles in the provision of technical assistance, information, and analytical support.
5. Funding is crucial for organizational startup and development, capacity-building, and general operating support to make the local side of a watershed partnership work.

## **STATE ROLE IN WATERSHED INITIATIVES**

**Univ. of Colorado Natural Resources Law Center (1998)**

*"Initiatives" = groups with various levels of government and private participation*

1. Legislative and administrative reforms should be pursued to bring an integrated geographic focus to all facets of state natural resources planning and management.
2. State agencies with water-related responsibilities should be vested with mandates and bureaucratic incentives that encourage their participation in, and support of, watershed initiatives.
3. Mechanisms that encourage or facilitate improved channels of communication and coordination among (and within) the various state agencies that interact with watershed initiatives should be provided through legislation or administrative policy.
4. As part of their overall watershed management approach, states should consider providing a legislative and/or administrative framework to encourage, in a broad way, the formation of watershed initiatives.
5. State funding programs for watershed efforts should be established where possible, and should be broad enough to include support for organizational, administrative, educational, and on-the-ground activities of selected initiatives.
6. States should establish general criteria and standards that watershed initiatives must meet in order to obtain the participation of state agencies, to compete for state funding, and to achieve state recognition.
7. Reforms that transfer the authority, responsibility, or accountability for resource management to watershed initiatives should not be pursued.

## ***AGENCY LINKAGES TO WATERSHED GROUPS***

Thomas (1999) (Univ. of Massachusetts)

1. Looked at California's 1991 MOU on Biodiversity as case study of multiple levels of agency involvement, using the attempt to form a Klamath Bioregional Council as the focus.
2. Several factors contributed to the failure to establish one:
  - a. Size of the Klamath Bioregion hindered social interaction
  - b. Line managers in most agencies resisted cooperation
  - c. US Forest Service, the largest landowner/manager, was not prepared to participate.
3. BLM line managers and field staff were able to routinely work with watershed organizations and subregional groups, and developed a positive reputation.
4. US Forest Service was more centralized and unresponsive, and did not have a good reputation with these organizations.
5. Public agencies differ significantly from community-based watershed organizations.
6. Centralized agencies – requiring field staff to clear decision through the hierarchy – tend to be unresponsive to local communities.
7. Decentralized authority structures – allowing field staff to act on behalf of their agency within watershed organizations – tend to enhance responsiveness in the agency culture and local interactions.

## ***FAILURE & SUCCESS LESSONS***

Woolley & McGinnis (1999)

- **Santa Ynez Watershed Enhancement & Management Plan (1995-6)**

Failure caused by:

- Conflicts of values and ideology, not about facts and science;
- Perception by property owners that the effort involved too many government representatives and environmental advocates, which put them on the defensive from the beginning of the process;
- Conflict over planning boundary (entire watershed versus 100 year floodplain) and issues (multiple vs. flood control);
- Sponsoring agencies withdrawing funds when focus narrowed down to flood plain and flood control

- **Sacramento River Landowner-based Watershed Groups**

“succeeded” due to:

- Actual range of interests and ideas not very broad; or
- “Facts” about watershed condition are clear and uncontested, so set of actions is unambiguous; or
- Organization is not, in fact, truly voluntary but operates under, more or less, explicit threat of external intervention by some other governmental level.

# ***QUALITY OF STAKEHOLDER-BASED DECISIONS***

Bierle (2000)

1. Concerns expressed that stakeholder processes may be too political and quality may be sacrificed, in particular that “good science” will not be used adequately in decision outcomes.
2. Looked at 100 attributes of 239 published case studies of stakeholder involvement in environmental decision –making.
3. Case study record suggests there should be little concern that stakeholder processes result in low quality decisions.
4. Majority of cases contained evidence of stakeholders:
  - Improving decisions over the status quo;
  - Adding new information, ideas and analysis;
  - Having adequate access to technical and scientific resources.
5. Processes that stressed consensus scored higher on substantive quality measures than those that did not. Data suggested interesting relationships between consensus building and quality of decisions.

## ***KEYS TO SUCCESS IN PARTNERSHIPS***

Leach, Pelkey & Sabatier (2000 & 2001)

1. Techniques for measuring success should:
  - Be multi-dimensional
  - Use both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews
  - Canvass a representative sample of participants.
2. Evaluations based on ultimate goals should be deferred 4-6 years into process, due to time to implement projects.
3. Data from CA and WA present a mixed picture of the perceived ability of watershed partnerships to achieve their stated goals & objectives.
4. Positive relationship between criteria & age of partnership
5. A positive impact on the most serious watershed problems was perceived by the study's participants.
6. Partnerships older than 4 years have achieved several benchmarks of success:
  - Agreements proposed restoration projects
  - Implementation of restoration projects
  - Monitoring of project impacts



## ***WATERSHED COUNCIL EFFECTIVENESS***

(Huntington & Sommarstrom 2000)

- Northwest watershed councils meet many expectations, but not all; they cannot address all of their watershed issues.
- Councils represent an improvement over the “status quo” or “No Council” option through their process and actions
- Better council planning processes tend to be associated with technically stronger conservation plans. These councils were better at avoiding projects with low restoration value and implementing projects with higher mean restoration value.
- State and federal incentives are needed to better motivate and increase the probability of getting landowners to voluntarily implement high priority restoration measures so that councils are less likely to turn toward lower priority activities.
- Relationships between agencies and the watershed community are usually definitely improved – better cooperation, coordination, communication – since the council formed.
- Councils’ roles and abilities usually improve with time, but the learning process can be sped up with assistance.
- Resolving issues within the scope of each council’s sphere of effective influence is much better done than those issues larger than a single watershed.

## ***INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES – SIERRA COUNTIES***

(Leisz & Nechodom 2001)

- Goal was to identify improved institutional means for counties to play more active roles in local watershed project development and implementation.
- Strongest overall recommendation would be for state, federal and local agencies to take steps necessary to strengthen county government's capacity to participate in strategic watershed planning and improvement. Specific recommendations include:
  - Increase response timeliness for competitive grant applications where possible.
  - Increase state and federal efforts to build technical capacity among local multi-stakeholder groups, especially those with county government participation or support.
  - Provide ample opportunities to engage local interests in science based risk assessment, particularly as science is applied to project design and implementation.
  - Strengthen existing mandates for federal and state land management agencies to more formally support and include county planning organizations in problem framing and decision making process.
  - Develop statewide guidelines for watershed scale natural resources planning elements in county general plans.
  - Develop a shared framework to evaluate county and local capacity, as well as strategies to improve capacity.
  - Periodically review progress in state and federal programs for building institutional capacity at the county level.
  - Foster and nurture local institutional innovation for strategic resources planning and management.

***TOP 10 WATERSHED LESSONS LEARNED:***  
(EPA 1997)

1. The Best Plans Have Clear Visions, Goals, and Actions Items.
2. Good Leaders are Committed and Empower Others.
3. Having a Coordinator at the Watershed Level is Desirable.
4. Environmental, Economic, and Social Values are Compatible.
5. Plans Only Succeed if Implemented
6. Partnerships Equal Power
7. Good Tools are Available
8. Measure, Communicate, and Account for Progress
9. Education and Involvement Drive Action
10. Build on Small Successes

# **AGENCY LESSONS**

## **For Watershed Partnerships**

- Born, S.M. and K.D. Genskow. 1999. Exploring the Watershed Approach: Critical Dimensions of State-Local Partnerships. The Four Corners Watershed Innovators Initiative Final Report. River Network, Portland OR. 56 p.
- Born, S.M. and K.D. Genskow. 2000. Toward Understanding New Watershed Initiatives. A report from the Madison Watershed Workshop (July 20-21, 2000). Univ. of Wisconsin – Madison. 23 p.
- Leisz, D. and M. Nechodom. 2001. "Institutional Capacities for Local Watershed Investment and Management in the Sierra Nevada: A review of four Sierran county governments." Report to the California Secretary of Resources and the Regional Council of Rural Counties. Draft. 26 p.
- Reike, B. and D. Kenney. 1997. Resource Management at the Watershed Level: An Assessment of the Changing Federal Role in the Emerging Era of Community-Based Watershed Management. Report to the Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission. Univ. of Colorado Law School, Natural Resources Law Center. Boulder CO. 71 p.
- University of Colorado School of Law. 1998. The State Role in Western Watershed Initiatives. Natural Resources Law Center, Research Report RR-18. Boulder CO. 91 p.
- Western States Water Council. 1998. State Watershed Strategy Guidebook. Western Governors' Association. [[www.westgov.org/wswc/guidebook.html](http://www.westgov.org/wswc/guidebook.html)] 69 p.
- Wondolleck, J. and S. Yaffee. 2000. Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management. Island Press, Covelo CA. 277 p.

Note: Access to most of the above reports can be obtained through the Watershed Management Council's website: [//www.watershed.org/forums](http://www.watershed.org/forums)